religion and morality. For the very minimum which both religion and ethics (as a regulative philosophy of conduct) must claim and defend, to their last man and his last breath, is that human aspiration and human effort towards ideal goals count for something in the real world, can make a difference to the course of history. Unless that minimum be granted, there can be no ground for believing in any effectiveness of mind, in any reality of spirit, whether divine or human, whether creative or merely groping dimly towards the good, the true, and the beautiful; no sense and no honesty in moral evaluation or in ameliorative efforts.

Here the case of Thomas Henry Huxley affords instructive illustration. Huxley, the most effective champion of Darwinism, an acknowledged leader of British biology in the later nineteenth century, the most positive of the Positivists, who had eloquently celebrated the iconoclastic thrusts of the mechanistic biology, in his famous Romanes Lecture *(Evolution and Ethics)* delivered at Oxford near the end of his life, revoked the main feature of his earlier teaching and called upon mankind to defy the laws of a mechanical nature which throughout his life he had so effectively expounded as all-sufficient. In essentials his new position was identical with that so well stated a little later by Robert Bridges, the poet: " Man is a spiritual being; the proper work of his mind is to interpret the world according to his highest nature, to conquer the material aspects of the world so as to bring

them into subjugation to the spirit."

In this matter Huxley was a true child of his time. In his own person he lived the mechanistic triumph and later repudiated it as not in the end tenable for a rational and moral being; though it is probable that he himself never